

TOYO TIRE AND RUBBER CO., LTD., et al.,
Plaintiff(s),

vs.

TOYAMA TYRE CORP., LTD.,
Defendant(s).

This matter is before the court on Defendants Toyama Tyre Corp., LTD., Toyama Tyre Corp., LTD., and Hong Kong Toyama Tyre Int'l, LTD.'S failure to comply with this Court's Orders (Docket Nos. 22, 24).

On January 31, 2014, the Court issued an Order to Show Cause instructing Defendants to show cause, in writing, no later than March 3, 2014, why they should not be sanctioned and/or why the Court should not recommend that default judgment be entered against them for failure to defend and failure to comply with the Court's prior order. *See* Court Order to Show Cause, Docket No. 24. The Order advised Defendants that failure to comply would result in a recommendation to the District Judge that default

1 judgment be entered against them. *Id.* Defendants have not complied or requested an extension of time in
2 which to comply.

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS THE RECOMMENDATION** of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge that the
5 Defendants' pleadings be STRICKEN.

6 **IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED** that the Clerk of the Court enter judgment accordingly.

7 Dated: March 11, 2014.

8
9
10 
11 **NANCY J. KOPPE**
12 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

13 **NOTICE**

14 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned
15 to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being
16 served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court.
17 Pursuant to Local Rule of Practice (LR) IB 3-2(a), any party wishing to object to the findings and
18 recommendations of a magistrate judge shall file and serve *specific written objections* together with
19 points and authorities in support of those objections, within fourteen days of the date of service of the
20 findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's
21 Findings and Recommendations." The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the
22 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's Order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153
23 (9th Cir. 1991). The points and authorities filed in support of the specific written objections are subject
24 to the page limitations found in LR 7-4.
25
26
27
28